

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

March 18, 2004 LB 1089

floor. I think this is a good way to go at it, so I urge your support. I won't take all my time. I will merely mention on the \$1.10, I don't think it makes a lot of difference, or \$1.05, or \$1.00, or 95 cents, or 90, because the assessment, the valuation keeps climbing. And that, I think, is an unfair situation to the taxpayers, and I also want to tell you that I don't have any solution for it. Thank you, Madam President.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Thank you, Senator Tyson. The next speaker is Senator Beutler, followed by Senators Wehrbein, Erdman and Bourne. Senator Beutler waives. The next speaker, Senator Wehrbein.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Thank you, Madam President and members of the body. I just want to make a couple of comments and I didn't want to use all my time. I punched in to answer questions, if there was, and I'll trust if there is. I am handing out a memorandum that just came in from David Cookson, who is the attorney working on the low-level nuclear waste issue. I got his permission to pass it out. So it is passing out. The status of interest and so forth, it is at 1.68. We had previously said it was 1.55. It's 1.68. But the real sobering issue is on the second page. If, in fact, and I'll admit it's an if, no one really knows, but we could run up as high as \$16 million a year at the 10 percent level, if we were to come up with the money and there was not a negotiation. And I freely admit there could, could well be negotiation, but it really emphasizes the point to me that that's why our committee included the \$160 million in that out year because that...we feel that is going to be a "due and owing" in some manner, at least better than 50/50 percent chance. And so that's the reason it's in. And I'm kind of relating to what Senator Bourne said. He's giving several "what if's," the things somewhat pessimistically I hope that they are. But these things are possible. But that is one of the reasons and that's what I wanted to emphasize and what I said is we've built this budget on on a three-year cycle because there are cycles in business, there are cycles in many other things. There's cycles in agriculture, and it goes on and on. And this is built on a cycle that it's going to improve, the economy will improve, albeit gradually, whatever the 49 of us think, I suppose. But